1	JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CABN 44332) United States Attorney		
3	BRIAN J. STRETCH (CABN 163973) Chief, Criminal Division		
<b>4</b> 5	OWEN P. MARTIKAN (CSBN 177104) Assistant United States Attorneys  450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055 San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone: (415) 436-7241 Facsimile: (415) 436-7234 owen.martikan@usdoj.gov  Attorneys for Plaintiff		
6 7			
8 9			
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
12	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
13	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ) No.: CR 08-04	W21 08.	
14	N ( )	07 JO W	
15	Plaintiff, STIPULATIO	ON AND [PROPOSED] LUDING TIME	
16	,		
17	17 NORMAN RAE,		
18	18 Defendant.		
19	19	\$	
20	20		
21	On July 29, 2008, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for a status conference.		
22	The parties stipulated and the Court agreed that time should be excluded from the Speedy Tria		
23	Act calculations from July 29, 2008, through September 4, 2008, fo	Act calculations from July 29, 2008, through September 4, 2008, for effective preparation of	
24	defense counsel. The parties represented that granting the continua	defense counsel. The parties represented that granting the continuance was the reasonable time	
25	necessary for effective preparation of defense counsel, taking into account the exercise of due		
26	26 diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties also agree	diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties also agreed that the ends of justice	

served by granting such a continuance outweighed the best interests of the public and the

STIP. & [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME CASE NO. CR08-0489 JSW

28

defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A). 1 SO STIPULATED: 2 DATED: 8/4/09 JOSEPH-R RUSSONIELLO 3 4 5 Attorneys for the United States 6 7 DATED: BARRY J. PORTMAN 8 9 10 Attorneys for Defendant 11 12 [PROPOSED] ORDER 13 As the Court found on July 29, 2008, and for the reasons stated above, an exclusion of time 14 from July 29, 2008, through September 4, 2008, is warranted because the ends of justice served 15 by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 16 See 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(8)(A). The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny 17 defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the 18 exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. 19 §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). 20 21 SO ORDERED. 22 23 24 DATED: August 8, 2008 25 HON. MART United States Magistrate Ju 26

STIP. & [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME CASE NO. CR08-0489 JSW

27

28